UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,855	07/16/2003	Frederic J. de Sauvage	39766-0065DV1	1789

25213 7590 12/29/2005

HELLER EHRMAN LLP
275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3506

EXAMINER	
HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1649	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/621,855	DE SAUVAGE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.	1649	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) 1-65 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The numbering of claims is not accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution.

When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 56-66 have been renumbered 55-65.

Election/Restriction

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-15, drawn to an isolated nucleic acid molecule, vectors, host cells, and method of producing a GFR*alpha*3 polypeptide, classified in Class 435, subclass 69.1.

II. Claims 16-22 & 49-54, drawn to GFR*alpha*3 polypeptide and chimeric polypeptides thereof, classified in Class 530, subclasses 350.

III. Claims 23-24, drawn to antibodies of a GFR*alpha*3 polypeptide, classified in Class 530, subclass 387.1+.

IV. Claim 25, drawn to a method of treating a neuronal disorder with an antibody of a GFR*alpha*3 polypeptide, classified in Class 424, subclass 130.1.

V. Claim 26-29, drawn to a method of measuring agonist binding to the GFR*alpha*3 receptor, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.21.

VI. Claim 30-48 & 55-65, drawn to a method of measuring autophosphorylation of a GFR*alpha*3 receptor construct, and kits thereof classified in Class 435, subclass 6.

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Although there are provisions under the section for "Relation of Inventions" in MPEP 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed proper because these products appear to constitute patently distinct inventions for the following reason:

Groups I-III are directed to products that are physically and functionally distinct, which include protein, nucleic acid, and antibodies. Each of these products can be prepared by different processes, such as though chemical synthesis or isolation from natural sources using various isolation/purification procedures. For example, the proteins of Group II are fundamentally different molecules than the nucleic acid molecules of Group I, which in turn can be used to clone the protein, detect expression of the protein, or used as therapeutic agents in gene therapy. The protein of Group II is also a fundamentally different molecule than the antibody of Group III, which can be generated by immunizing animals with a small synthetic portion of the full length polypeptide. Although the antibody of Group III can be used in isolating the protein of Group II, the antibody can also be used diagnostically in other ways, such as in affinity chromatography or in immunoassays, or as a therapeutic agents themselves. Moreover, the proteins of Group II can be utilized in making the antibodies of Group III, but not vice versa. Additionally, neither the proteins of Group II, or antibodies of Group III require the vectors and

host cells of Group I, and vice versa. It is pointed out that there is a proper distinction between these groups, since each product is not required in order for the other to exist. Thereby, these groups are distinct and separable for the reasons stated.

Although there are provisions under the section for "Relation of Inventions" in MPEP 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed proper because these methods appear to constitute patently distinct inventions for the following reason:

Groups IV-VI are directed to methods to treat neuronal disorders in a patient, methods of measuring agonist binding to the GFR*alpha*3 receptor, or methods of measuring autophosphorylation of GFR*alpha*3 receptor constructs. Each of the methods require physically and functionally distinct elements and possess limitations with different and distinct goals. For example, the use of constructs and transfected cells in the method of Group VI is distinct from the use of the antibodies required in the method of Group IV and the agonists and polypeptides required in the method of Group V, and vice versa. Additionally, the method of Group IV requires patients with specific neuronal disorders not required in the detection methods of Groups V and VI, and vice versa. Moreover, solid supports, as required in the method of Group VI, are not required in the methods of Groups IV or V, and vice versa. These inventions are, therefore, patentably distinct, since one is not required for the other.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, they have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the non-coextensiveness of the search and examination for each group would constitute an undue burden on the examiner

to search and consider all the separable groups with their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i).

5. Lastly, note that *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ2d 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995) and *In re Brouwer*, 77 F.3d 422, 37 USPQ2d 1663 (Fed. Cir. 1996) addressed the issue of whether an otherwise conventional process could be patented if it were limited to making or using a nonobvious product.

> In situations where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, an applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect claims to either the product or process. The claims to the non-elected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration. However, in the case of an elected product claim, when a product claim is found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowable product claim will be rejoined. Withdrawn process claims not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (571) 272-0885. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.
December 27, 2005

ROBERT C. HAYES, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER